

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY



0 1620 0789 8156

SAKHAROV- SOLZHENITSYN FRAUD

**WHAT'S BEHIND THE
HUE AND CRY
for
"INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM"**

Gus Hall

PG
3476
S695
Z67
1973
c.1

HSS

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

GUS HALL, General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. since 1959, was born in 1910 in Minnesota. At the age of 15 he went to work; at 17 he was a member of the Communist Party and an organizer for the Young Communist League. He was a leader of the Little Steel Strike in 1937 in Ohio and was one of the founders of the United Steelworkers of America. He served in the Navy in World War II and was a leader of the Communist Party in Ohio. In the 1950s he served an 8-year prison sentence under a Smith Act frameup. Gus Hall is well known as a public speaker, is an internationally recognized authority on Marxism-Leninism, and is the author of numerous articles and pamphlets and two books. His second book, *Imperialism Today: An Evaluation of Major Issues and Events of Our Time*, was recently published by International Publishers. Gus Hall was the Communist Party's candidate for President in 1972, together with Vice-Presidential candidate Jarvis Tyner.

ISBN 0-87898-102-0



Published by

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

205 West 19 Street • 9th Floor • New York, N.Y. 10011

October 1973

PRINTED
IN
U.S.A.

THE SAKHAROV-SOLZHENITSYN FRAUD

What's Behind the Hue and Cry for "Intellectual Freedom"

by GUS HALL

The Class Question

The observation of events is one level of consciousness. The understanding of their essence is quite another matter. In order to acquire a meaningful understanding of events, it is necessary to dig into the causes and their effects; it is necessary to probe beneath the surface. In order to acquire an understanding of a specific phenomenon it is necessary to study it within a larger frame of reference with the guidance of more fundamental points of reference.

For example, Nixon is tricky, deceitful, crafty, treacherous, corrupt, and evil in many other ways, but this description in itself does not explain the events that led to Watergate. The fact that Hitler was a sadistic, fiendish, cold-blooded killer does not explain fascism in Germany. Nixon, Churchill, Hitler, deGaulle, Heath, Mussolini and Franco, reflect and represent currents and specific forces at a specific time in the historic development of capitalist society in their respective countries. Each, in his own way, not only represents but is part of the class that is the ruling class in a capitalist country. If the problem was just Nixon's trickiness, the solution would be simply to fence him off on an island in Florida.

What class does Nixon represent? He represents the class that dominates life in the United States—and obviously that class is monopoly capital. That class dominates the economy, the old political parties, government on all levels, culture, education and the mass media. That fact becomes a basic point of reference for Nixon's and Agnew's corruption and tricks. The historic rise of a police-state structure within the protected shell of the executive branch of government took place only because monopoly capitalism needed such a structure in its drive for ever greater corporate profits and power.

In the capitalist countries the ruling class is monopoly capital, the exploited class is the working class, and the struggle between them is the class struggle. This is the most basic of all points of reference. It is the pattern in domestic affairs and it is the pattern that prevails on a world scale. However, now there are countries where the working class is in power. Thus, the class struggle on the world scale is reflected today in the struggle between the two world systems, capitalism and socialism. There is no way to sidestep this reality, this fundamental point of reference.

In the overall, historic process, capitalism represents the past. It is reactionary because it does not want to bow to the new forces that arise from the new level of science and technology.

Socialism is life's answer. It is the solution to these new problems. It is the new political and social instrument with which civilization is climbing to a new plateau, a new quality of life.

Where one stands in relationship to this struggle is the most basic of all "basics."

Most of us are interested in what happens in all parts of the world, but we are most interested in events that have a direct effect on our immediate spot in the sun. The positions and statements of Andrei D. Sakharov and Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn are very much related to developments in our part of the world. They have become a factor in the struggle against monopoly capitalism here. It is from the viewpoint of how their positions are a factor in the class struggle in the United States that we will discuss their "basics."

Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn are issuing daily communiques from Moscow. They are getting top billing in the United States press and mass media. Their campaign is conducted behind a curtain of deceit that is called "intellectual freedom" and "liberty." The most important and most meaningful question is, "intellectual freedom" to do what? "Liberty" to do what?

The world has just witnessed what "intellectual freedom" and "liberty" mean to the forces of reaction. "Liberty" was the Junta's curtain of deceit in Chile. Using the code words "liberty," "democracy," and "freedom," the Junta crushed democracy in Chile and murdered its freely elected President. It banned the Communist, Socialist and all other progressive and Left Parties, outlawed the

trade unions, and went on a rampage of killing, beating and jailing thousands of Chileans and foreigners. Then the generals proceeded to demonstrate their interpretation of "intellectual freedom" by closing down all progressive publications and bookstores, burning books, and obliterating all outward signs of the Allende government.

And so, when one speaks of "liberty," "democracy," or "intellectual freedom," they must be examined in context. This is true in Chile, and it is also true for Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn. It is significant that Sakharov has refused to condemn the fascist Junta regime in Chile on the spurious grounds that "Chile is too far away."

The major part of this pamphlet will deal with the specific "basics" of Sakharov and then with the role of Solzhenitsyn. In the concluding pages, the discussion deals with the question of "intellectual freedom" to what end, and for what purposes, and the question—should a socialist society, in the name of "intellectual freedom," makes its press and mass media available to renegades to spread slanders and attacks against socialism? Such questions are discussed in relation to socialist democracy and the struggle to give "intellectual freedom" a direction to strengthen the fight for democracy, peace and socialism.

The "Basics" of Sakharov

A close examination of Sakharov's writings is very revealing. Initially, one is reluctant to believe that anyone in his right mind could write such utter political garbage. To the *New York Times* and Harrison Salisbury, Sakharov is "the most brilliant of a brilliant group." After such praise from the mouthpiece of monopoly capital it is necessary for those who oppose monopoly capitalism to take a deeper look at the basics. The basics of Sakharov were presented in a thesis published as a textbook by the *New York Times* in 1968 with the title *Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom*. Of the 160 pages in the book, 60 pages consist of Sakharov's text and 90 pages are Salisbury's "introductory notes," "afterword," and "interpretations." The text is hailed as one of the most important documents on "communist affairs" by none other than Henry Kissinger.

It is also easier to understand Sakharov's current activities, including his "communiques," when they are related to the basic thesis that he presented in 1968. There is a point of special interest for us in the United States because the main point of reference in Sakharov's thesis on the capitalist world is the United States. From the descriptions, it is difficult to recognize that the capitalist country he refers to is the United States. To those of us who live here and know its realities, Sakharov is writing about some mythical wonderland on some distant planet.

As to Sakharov, let me say right off that after a deeper study one is forced to come to the conclusion that he is not an innocent babe in the ideological and political woods. Behind the lofty words about the need for an ideal world of peace and love, behind the abstractions about the flowering of science and technology and the "warnings" of a coming catastrophe, there is a political and ideological swindler. Sakharov is an anti-working class, anti-socialist reprobate and a willing tool and apologist for imperialism. He exhibits racism. He is enamored with capitalism from afar.

One may ask: Is that overstating the case? Is that too strong a characterization? If you think so, I ask you to reserve your decision until we can deal with the "basics" of Sakharov's garbage.

"The presence of millionaires in the United States is not a serious economic burden in view of their small number. The total consumption of the rich in the United States is less than 20%." So states this apologist for monopoly capital. That by itself is nothing less than a political swindle. Sakharov must know that the diet of the rich is not the basic problem of capitalism. The basic problem is that 5% of the population owns, controls and operates the economy of the country to satisfy their bottomless, gluttonous, all-devouring drive for private profits. If, as Sakharov claims, the food intake of the rich is the problem under capitalism, that could be simply solved by putting them on a strict 500-calorie-a-day diet! With this utter nonsense is not Sakharov covering up for monopoly capital?

But he is not satisfied with just covering up. He draws the logical conclusion from his weird assessment of U.S. capitalism: "There are, of course, situations where revolution is the only way out, but that is not the case in the United States and other de-

veloped capitalist countries, as suggested incidentally in the programs of the communist parties of these countries." What unmitigated arrogance! What presumptuousness—"incidentally suggested by the communist parties." No, Mr. Physicist, not "incidentally suggested"! The working class and the communist parties of the capitalist countries have a glorious history of fighting against monopoly capital and a proud history of fighting for socialism. No, not "incidentally suggested." Heroic men and women have given their lives in this struggle!

As to his contention that a revolution against capitalism is not necessary in the United States, Japan, West Germany, Britain, Italy, France and "other developed capitalist countries", it is possible that one can, to some extent, overlook his ignorance about these matters because the communists, workers, peasants and intellectuals of what is now the Soviet Union carried out the glorious, historic October Socialist Revolution before his time. Incidentally, without their historic contributions he would be wallowing and grubbing for a livelihood in the slums, in the dilapidated factories and farms run by the profit-hungry capitalists and feudal lords of a Czarist Russia.

Had his egotistical shield permitted him to look at the experience of others, he would have been able to see that a revolution, a socialist revolution, is the only path open to the working class and the people to rid themselves of the exploitation, the oppression, the racism and the wars—all directly related to the corporate drive for private profits of that 5% of the population. It is the only path open for human progress.

Monopoly capital will never "reform" itself out of existence. Capitalism has become an obstacle to human progress. History has proclaimed its removal from the world scene as an absolute necessity. History has not "incidentally suggested" the revolutionary struggle against capitalism. It is a mandate of history, of life. So again, one must ask: is not this thesis of Sakharov a thesis of counter-revolution?

Now let us turn to another of Sakharov's "basics": "The development of modern society in both the Soviet Union and the United States is following the *same course* of increasing complexity of structure and industrial management giving rise, in both countries,

to managerial groups that are *similar in social character*." (Emphasis mine—G.H.)

There are complexities and there are complexities. There are complexities of a dying, decaying system of exploitation, and there are complexities of a new developing system based on the principle of production for the good of all. There are complexities of a system that exploits, robs, oppresses and conducts wars of aggression, to the end of the rich getting richer while the poor get poorer. And there are complexities—but of a totally different kind—of a system building its industrial base, overcoming the backwardness inherited from capitalism, and building the new system on the basis that the industries and all economic pillars of production and distribution are socially owned and operated.

In all of these cases Sakharov's thesis is a clumsy cover for capitalism, by his attempt to cover up the basic class difference between the two systems of the two countries. After the above piece of cheap trickery, he adds, "We must therefore acknowledge that there is no *qualitative* difference in the structure of society of the two countries in terms of distribution and consumption." (Emphasis mine—G.H.) In a thesis in which the realities of life, or truth, are not considered necessary, it is possible to "acknowledge that there is no qualitative difference in structure . . . in terms of distribution and consumption," and to state that the "social character" of the "groups in management" is the same. But dealing with objective reality, with real life, with real-life issues and forces, it is necessary to say that Sakharov's concepts are pure poppycock.

The "social character" of the groups in a society is determined by the class they serve, by the social and economic system of which they are a part. In a capitalist society the "managerial group" is basically a part of and serves the corporate drive for private profits. They are part of the "structure" of exploitation of the many for the benefit of the few. Under capitalism the "managerial group" is part of the exploiting corporate structure. The attempt to separate them somehow from their class and its system of exploitation is trickery.

The "social character" of the people who have the responsibility of running the industries and the economy in a socialist society

reflects that reality. They are part of the "structure" of producing goods and services for all of the people. They are part of the socialist structure. They are socialist men and women.

The same is true of "distribution and consumption." In a capitalist society distribution and consumption cannot be separated from the class structure of capitalism or from its system of exploitation. Consumption is related to class exploitation and corporate profits. It is part of the system of exploitation.

The monopoly corporations control production, distribution and consumption. The current skyrocketing prices are but an example of this fact. The corporations are using real and artificially created shortages to manipulate prices and to take back an even bigger slice of what they pay as wages to workers. With inflation more money passes through the workers' hands, but in the end it results in less food, clothing and shelter.

Production, distribution and consumption in a capitalist society are geared to serve the drive for corporate profits. Production, distribution and consumption in a socialist society are geared to produce and distribute products to all the people in the best possible fashion. There is, therefore, a basic *qualitative* difference in production, distribution and consumption between the two systems.

The Sakharov swindle is an attempt to cover up for capitalism, while at the same time slandering socialism.

Covering Up for Racism

Now let us look at another "basic" in the Sakharov thesis. In speaking about the racist discrimination against Black Americans, Sakharov states: "Our propaganda materials usually assert that there is crying inequality in the United States while the Soviet Union has something entirely just, entirely in the interests of the working people. . . . I have no intentions of minimizing the aspect of poverty and lack of rights, but we must *clearly understand* that this problem is not primarily a class problem, but a racial problem, involving the racism and egotism of white workers, and that the *ruling group* [notice he does not want to say 'ruling class'—G.H.] in the United States is interested in solving this problem." (Emphasis mine—G.H.) And, as if that were not enough, Sakharov adds, "It seems to me that the socialist camp should be interested

in letting the ruling group in the United States settle the Negro problem without aggravating the situation in the country." (Emphasis mine—G.H.) Let the ruling class in the United States settle the "Negro problem"! That idea is not new or unique, but to see such blatant racism in print is disgusting and shocking. It is a cowardly act of surrender to the racist oppressors.

There were many, including those in the United States, who said, "Let Hitler and the German ruling class settle the 'Jewish problem' in Germany." Voices are also heard saying, "Let Portugal settle the Angola and other colonial problems." Or, "Let the British settle the 'Irish problem' in Ireland." Or, "Let the Chilean Junta settle the fate of the political exiles and Chilean people, in blood!" And, to add more fuel to the fire, Sakharov excuses the inaction of government bodies because, as he states, action would possibly result in "activating extreme leftist and extreme rightist parties." Such statements are more outright racism! They are unabashed cover-ups for racism.

White workers and white people generally are influenced by racism. This is one of the most serious problems in the United States. It is a serious obstacle to uniting the working class. It is an obstacle to building an anti-monopoly movement. There is a movement and a struggle against racism in the United States, but it is a movement not by, but against, the ruling class. Sakharov tries to cover up the fact that the roots of racism are in the very bowels of monopoly capital that he defends. It is intertwined with the system of class exploitation. To say that the "ruling class is interested in solving this problem" is as big a falsehood as it is possible to say about the United States scene. There is not one iota of evidence in the more than 350-year history of the U.S. that would in any way give credence to such idiocy. Have the slavemasters anywhere in the world ever been "interested" in the freeing of the slaves?

To add to the criminal nature of Sakharov's thesis, he infers that those who speak out against racism are responsible for "aggravating the situation." The ruling class has used this phony argument throughout history; that the victims of oppression make it worse by fighting against their oppression. The logic of such advice is for the oppressed to suffer the racist indignities, to

starve and suffer in silence, to get kicked and be humiliated, but say "thank you" because if they don't they will be "aggravating the situation." The thesis in all its ugly aspects is an apology for the actions of monopoly capital. Silence about an evil, especially the evil of racism, makes one guilty of acquiescence. It bothers Sakharov that the people of the world speak out against the racism of capitalism. It seems to irritate Sakharov that the Soviet Union takes a forthright stand against racism!

Yes, there is a "crying inequality" in every phase of life in the United States. The United States has a 350-year history of brutal, racist oppression practiced against Black Americans. There is racist oppression of millions of Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Indian and Asian Americans and there is the basic "crying inequality" that is the outcome of the system of class exploitation. There is the basic inequality of 90% of the population barely making a living and the unprecedented profits of the other 5 per cent.

To say that "the ruling class is interested in solving this problem" is like saying that the wolf is interested in solving the grazing problem and for that reason keeps on killing the sheep. The monopoly corporations are interested in only one thing—more private profits and unlimited power. They will never willingly give up either their class system of exploitation or their system of racist exploitation and oppression.

Even the phrase, "We must clearly understand that this problem is not a class problem," is racist. What does it imply? It implies that the working-class forces therefore should not be concerned because it is not "a class problem." In the Sakharov thesis there is the benevolent, magnanimous, concerned white capitalist class, that is so "interested in solving this problem" if only given half a chance. But in all of Sakharov's thesis there is not a word about the heroic struggles of the oppressed, not a word about the growing unity of Black and white, not a word about the working-class movement and its struggles. Sakharov has eyes only for the racist ruling class.

Yes, socialism in the USSR is "entirely just," entirely in the interests of the working people. It is a working-class power. There are no exploited classes or oppressed nations or peoples in the Soviet Union. That is an undeniable fact. Even Sakharov dares

not deny that the Soviet Union has burned out the racist structure that was inherited from Czarism; the cruel capitalism and the brutal, backward feudalism that his close friend Solzhenitsyn glorifies in his writings. Even he does not dare deny the historic fact that the Soviet Union is the first country in the world that has wiped out a major ideological underbrush when it illegalized and burned out anti-Semitism—one of the evils left over from the Czarist bigoted past.

Even a Sakharov dares not deny that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a multi-national federation, living and building socialism in peace and equality. Sakharov dares not deny this. That slander, that crime, was left for the *New York Times* and Salisbury to commit. In their 90 pages they dug up and rewrote all the filth, the slander and the falsehoods that have been flowing in the anti-socialist, anti-working-class sewers throughout the world for over 100 years. This, of course, became part of the "Sakharov textbook."

There is really no limit to the unbelievable idiocy in Sakharov's "basics." Listen to this, for example: "National egotism gave rise to colonial oppression, nationalism and racism." Today most serious students throughout the world are aware that it is the drive of monopoly corporations for more super-profits that gave rise to and sustains colonial oppression and its accompanying ideological cover, namely, racism. "Egotism" is not the cause of imperialism. Imperialism is a logical, inevitable stage of capitalist development. But of course this is exactly what Sakharov wants to hide.

A Defender of Imperialism

United States imperialism and the United States armed forces invaded Cuba, Santo Domingo and other countries without provocation. The United States naval fleets prowl the waters in every corner of the world. United States troops are everywhere. The United States has over one thousand overseas military bases. The United States corporations are working with and financing Portugal's brutal, racist oppression of people in Africa. The United States banks are bankrolling the racist regimes in South Africa, Angola and Zimbabwe. According to Sakharov they are not doing this because they want to enslave or oppress anyone, but only

because of their "egotism." It is their "egotism" that drives them to commit these crimes! In Sakharov's book these are nothing but "ego trips" of monopoly capital. The "egotism" of U.S. imperialism, or of any other imperialism, is its monstrous drive for profits and power; its insatiable drive for the intensification of oppression and exploitation of greater numbers of people and natural resources and for more massive super-profits.

Sakharov mocks the anti-imperialist movement and the world communist movement and says that they unite "for the purpose of combatting the underlying *so-called imperialist peril* somewhere in Africa, in Latin America or in the Middle East." (Emphasis mine—G.H.) The "so-called imperialist peril" has killed and maimed millions of people in Indochina, in Africa, Latin America and the Middle East! For the millions enslaved and oppressed by imperialism the "so-called imperialist peril" is a daily life-and-death question. The "so-called imperialist peril" keeps hundreds of millions, generation after generation, in dire hunger. But again Sakharov slanders the victims, not the criminals. The "so-called" Sakharov thesis is not a "so-called" crime, it is a real, unforgivable crime.

As you can see, Sakharov's "basics" cover the world. Wherever imperialism is active Sakharov comes to its defense. He comes to the support of Israel's aggression in the Middle East. But it is not just support. His crime is even bigger with the declaration, "In the Middle East direct responsibility rests not with the United States but with the Soviet Union." What could be a more criminal distortion of the truth?

In Sakharov's book the Soviet Union bears the "direct responsibility" because it has supported the just struggles for national independence of the people in Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and the Arab people of Palestine. The United States which has supported and armed the aggressor, Israel, "bears no responsibility." This is again the same warped logic; not the aggressor but the victim is at fault. And if you help the victim you are "directly responsible" for the situation.

Sakharov does not have one word of criticism for the U.S. oil corporations who are the real pirates in the Middle East. Not Rockefeller, Shell or Texaco, but the Soviet Union, is "directly

responsible." It is difficult to characterize such trash because it goes against all known facts—it is based on a total falsehood.

That the *New York Times*, Salisbury and Kissinger think this is "brilliant" is quite understandable. They represent monopoly capital. They represent the capitalist system and a dying cause that can only be defended by lies and falsehoods. But this total distortion of obvious facts should embarrass even them.

After apologizing for imperialism's racism and oppression and after slandering the victims and their struggles, Sakharov goes on to pontificate; "International affairs must be permeated with a democratic spirit," "with a consistency of principles." There is a cruel "consistency" in Sakharov's thesis. It is his "principle" to support and apologize for all the crimes of imperialism no matter how vile and vicious.

The "Convergence" Notion

We are still not through with Sakharov's "basics." In fact we are now coming to the most basic of all of his "basics." We must now deal with the daddy of all frauds. It is the concept of the "convergence" of capitalism and socialism. In this projection the two systems are going to come together like two peaceful streams and together in delightful bliss produce a new social order. What the offspring will be like, Sakharov and the rest of the "convergenites" never discuss in any detail, and for a very good reason—because the offspring they are out to produce looks very much like capitalism. The real aim is to liquidate socialism by "converging" with capitalism.

The Sakharovs of the world have a problem. Most of the people in the world today are rejecting capitalism as a way of life. They very accurately ask: How can one talk about converging with a smelly, putrid, dying stream, polluted with exploitation, oppression and racism? They say that a society which is based on the principle of operating for the good of all the people cannot converge with a society whose basic premise of operation is to exploit the many for the enrichment of a few. They ask the question—how can a society where the industries, finances, communications and distribution are all in the public domain—socially owned and operated—converge with a society

in which everything is in the grip of a few monopoly corporations?

It is impossible to "converge" with a society in which the steel industry is owned by three corporations, the auto industry, the chemical, tire and electrical industries are each owned and controlled by three corporations. It is obvious that the two cannot mix. Something has to give. The direction of history and life argues that capitalism will have to give way. The "convergenites" are therefore out to save capitalism by talk of "convergence."

This has been a problem for the ideologists of "convergence." So Sakharov sets out to sweeten the bitter pill: "Both capitalism and socialism are capable of long term development, borrowing positive elements from each other and actually coming closer to each other." "There are no grounds for asserting that the capitalist mode of production leads the economy into a blind alley, or that it is obviously inferior to the socialist mode of labor productivity." "There are certainly no grounds for asserting that capitalism always leads to the absolute impoverishment of the working class." Sakharov could just as well have added, "The world is round."

Such statements carry as much weight as "the world is coming to an end." Does capitalism have the "capabilities of long term development"? There is nothing in the track record of the past years that would in any way indicate such a conclusion. In fact, the crisis upon crisis that world capitalism is suffering from would indicate just the opposite. And if we take into consideration the capitalist world as a whole, it adds up to continuing decline in its development capabilities. Capitalist countries can have their ups and downs, but the long range outlook is down-hill.

Whether one calls it a "blind alley" or not the fact is that capitalism, like all present and past societies, develops according to inner laws. Thus capitalism has gone through a number of phases of its development, from the period of small entrepreneurs to monopoly capitalism, to state monopoly capitalism. No Marxist has ever said it would reach a stone wall and collapse, but the direction of its development is clear. As a social and economic system it is less and less able to meet the needs of society. It cannot cope with the problems that arise from the revolution in science and technology. It decays with the growth of a bureau-

cratic parasitic element. There is alienation—the gap between it and the people expands. As a system, it less and less responds to the needs of the people. As a result of this development the class confrontation sharpens. It is this historic process that Sakharov tries to hide in his talk about the “blind alley.”

Does this process lead to the impoverishment of the working class? As a historic worldwide process it certainly does. This process is related to the monopolization of capitalist development. It has its roots in the decaying, parasitic process of capitalism. Sakharov gives no grounds for his assertions, but the aim is to give the impression that this decaying system has everlasting life. Any student of historic development would say “nonsense” to such allusions to capitalist immortality.

It may not be obvious to Sakharov that the socialist mode of labor productivity is superior to capitalism, but to any student of history it is as obvious as the fact that the capitalist mode was superior to the mode under slavery and feudalism. A basic law of capitalism is that the product is produced socially, but confiscated by the corporations. The great merit of socialism is that it eliminates this basic contradiction. The “flaw” in the capitalist production process is that the producers, the workers, are mere cogs in the wheels of production, alienated and treated like cogs. Socialism changes this relationship. From the isolated, alienated cog the worker is transformed into a participant with the voice of a trustee. The worker gains a new incentive, a new sense of personal satisfaction and of social responsibility. To deny this elementary fact is to slander socialism. If such trash does not come from a conscious swindler, then it can only come from one who knows nothing of the “mode of labor productivity” either under socialism or under capitalism.

Are capitalism and socialism “actually coming closer to each other?” Imperialism has lost its dominance in the world and it is being forced to deal more realistically with the new rising power of world socialism, to face the realities of today’s world. But this is not what Sakharov has in mind. What he is saying is that capitalism is more and more like socialism, and, in turn, socialism is more and more like capitalism. This of course is more and more nonsense. Monopoly capitalism is not socialism,

and socialism is not monopoly capitalism and they will never “converge.” Sakharov’s “convergence” is nonsense, and it is dangerous nonsense because its purpose is to create the impression that there is no need to fight capitalism. For Sakharov, capitalism is not so bad in the first place, and in due time it will “converge” with socialism. This is but another convenient cover for monopoly capitalism.

The concept of “convergence” has no basis in today’s reality or in history. It is in contradiction to the laws of social development. It is an absolute fantasy to believe that Ford, Rockefeller, the handful of rich families who own and control General Motors, General Electric, U.S. Steel, the Bank of Morgan, the Bank of America and National City Bank are somehow going to make a declaration: “We have seen the light, our system of robbery and exploitation is wrong and unjust. Therefore, we are going to turn over a new leaf. To begin with we are going to operate as non-profit organizations and we are going to follow this up by turning all of our factories and banks over to the good people whom we have cruelly robbed, exploited, enslaved, imprisoned and murdered all these years. We are going to do what Sakharov says, we are going to converge with socialism.”

It will be a full year of below-zero days on Wall Street before anything like that will happen. The fact is that there is no one in the ranks of monopoly capital who even for one second has any thoughts of “converging with socialism.” They only pay for and support the propaganda for the “idea.” They see it as an antidote to the process of radicalization, as a way of diluting the sense of class antagonism behind which they can continue to rob and exploit. Sakharov is an instrument in this ideological game of “convergence.”

It is also true that Sakharov has no real belief in his concept of capitalism “converging” with socialism. In a recent interview he stated, “I am skeptical of socialism on the whole.” He is not skeptical, he is enamored with capitalism. He cannot deny the great historic progress in the building of socialism, so he followed his remarks by saying: “The positive results have been universal; that is, they would have occurred anyway even under different circumstances and the system cannot take credit for them.” Only

an ignoramus or a political and ideological swindler could make such statements.

The past fifty years are proof of how wrong such assertions are. Countries under colonial oppression remain underdeveloped. Countries that have won political independence have had the choice of three possible paths of development. There is not one country that has made headway along the capitalist path. Some who tried are bogged down in debt and corruption. Some have taken the path called "non-capitalist development." They are doing much better. Still others have taken the socialist path. They have made historic strides towards becoming modern, industrial states. The progress of the countries which have won political independence can be measured by how close they are to the socialist path of development.

Meaningless, abstract humanitarian-sounding generalizations have always been the tools of demagogy. They serve as a convenient smokescreen for reactionary ideas. Sakharov has mastered this art, as can be seen from the following: "The division of mankind threatens its destruction." "In the face of these perils any action increasing the division of mankind, any preaching of incompatibility of world ideologies and nations is madness and a crime." This sounds very nice, but in reality it is pure demagogy.

The "madness and a crime" is Sakharov's. How can anyone seriously talk about the division of mankind without discussing the causes and the forces that bring about such divisions? It is obvious why Sakharov does not discuss these matters. If he did, his whole thesis would collapse. His "convergence" theme would go down the drain. What "divides mankind" is imperialism. What creates the antagonistic classes in a capitalist society is class exploitation. It is this same drive for profits by imperialism which "divides mankind." It is this which creates the line between the exploiters and the exploited. It is this struggle which divides the forces between those who are on the side of progress and those who want to hold on to the old system of imperialist slavery. There is no other force that "threatens mankind." What threatens all humanity is imperialist aggression which is inherent in capitalism.

It is not the "preaching" that gives birth to the "incompatibility

of world ideologies." The ideology of the working class and the ideology defending capitalist slavery are incompatible because the class self-interests, the class struggle, are incompatible. What Sakharov really wants to say is that the struggle of the workers against the system of capitalism is "madness," "a crime." But the self-interest of a steelworker and the U.S. Steel Corporation are incompatible.

The Messiah proclaims, "converge!" "Let imperialism go on plundering, murdering, enslaving and exploiting. If you do not you will suffer the consequences. If you continue fighting imperialism you will destroy mankind." So says Sakharov when he calls for socialism to surrender to imperialism via "convergence." On the other hand, and in fact, it is this struggle against imperialism and for human progress, for socialism, led by the working class, that will save mankind from destruction.

What would "ideological compatibility" entail if not the surrender to imperialism? And that is exactly the meaning of Sakharov's "convergence" thesis—surrender!

The "Two Superpowers" Concept

It is possible that Sakharov has the dubious distinction of originating the phrase "the two great superpowers." He used it in his 1968 thesis. In today's world this fraud has become the most convenient cover for imperialism. Spokesmen for U.S. imperialism, including Nixon, use it as often as possible.

Imperialism likes this phrase because it creates a popular image of the United States as just another peaceful country, in fact just another "world power" like the Soviet Union. Imperialism likes this stance because it hides its crimes, its exploitation of peoples and nations, its acts of murder and aggression. It also hides its racism. It can hide its crimes in the shadow of socialism. The U.S. wants to hide the fact that its "great power" is used to exploit and oppress peoples and nations.

This was the purpose of the phrase "the two superpowers." It hides the crimes of United States imperialism, and on the other hand, it slanders the Soviet Union and socialism. It diverts the masses from seeing the basic, humanistic nature of socialism. It confuses the masses about the fact that socialism is a working-

class power, that its very inner essence is that it is motivated only by that which is in the best interests of the people.

The "two superpowers" concept has a very definite aim. It is calculated to cover up the fact that the United States, an imperialist power, is motivated by the drive to make super-profits and to make its rich super-rich. It therefore has an inherent motive for its policy of aggression and for wars of conquest in the drive for ever greater profits.

On the other hand, this swindle is calculated to cover up the fact that the Soviet Union, a socialist country, in which the drive for profits does not and cannot exist, is inherently motivated to struggle for world peace and the progress of all humanity. The "two superpowers" concept fits in very well with the fraud of "convergence" and the rest of Sakharov's ideological garbage.

From the above it should not surprise anyone that Sakharov extends his thesis to almost every area of human existence, such as: "This position of the intelligentsia in society renders senseless any loud demands that the intelligentsia subordinate its strivings to the will and interest of the working class." This problem obviously bugs Sakharov's overextended ego and intellectual snob-bishness. The will and the interests of the working class and the intelligentsia need not contradict each other. It is nothing more than a demagogic appeal by Sakharov to the intellectuals.

Sakharov has presented a four-stage plan of "convergence." In the first stage, he sees "a growing ideological struggle in the socialist countries that will lead to a deep ideological split on an international, national and inter-party scale." So, as the first step, Sakharov envisions the destruction of the communist parties through "ideological splits" on all levels. This has been on the agenda of the capitalist class in every capitalist country since the birth of the communist parties. It is no more than wishful thinking.

In the second stage Sakharov sees developments that will lead "to the victory of the leftist, reformist wing of the bourgeoisie." Not a victory of the people or the working class, but a victory for "a wing" of the capitalist class. In Sakharov's thesis there is not a word about defeating monopoly capital.

For the third stage Sakharov sees some kind of a general

"solving the problem of the poor nations" as a result of the good will of the "reform wing" of capitalism.

The fourth stage then will lead to the "creation of a world government." Only a swindler or one who lives totally in a make-believe world could conjure up such fantasies.

But Sakharov follows through on one question after another. In his thesis, "Stalin is more dangerous than Hitler;" "Hitlerism and Stalinism" are the same thing. What a cover-up for fascism!

And, of course, Sakharov praises the works of his long-time fellow-swindler Solzhenitsyn with the words, "They contain profound, artistic and philosophical generalizations."

Solzhenitsyn's Support of Imperialism

Like Sakharov, Solzhenitsyn has also just issued a position paper. In the past he has advocated the return of Soviet lands to the feudal slavemasters. He has criticized the Russian church for not fighting to turn back the clock to the murky backwardness of the Czars and the Rasputins.

But this new thesis of Solzhenitsyn particularizes his position on current events. In its general content it is an across-the-board criticism of everything progressive in the world, and an across-the-board criticism of everyone in the world for not actively enough supporting the cause of anti-socialism and pro-imperialism. Solzhenitsyn thinks that "non-alignment" is not pro-imperialist enough. In his thesis "non-alignment" is hypocritical because it does not "openly" side with imperialism.

Sneeringly he states: "It is perfectly proper to protest if you don't risk being denounced by the Left. In fact it is always better to protest together with the Left." "The various forms of 'neutrality' and 'non-alignment' require you always to bow and scrape towards one side and always to kick the other side, which happens to be the side that feeds you."

It would seem to me that Solzhenitsyn's own parasitic existence would be a good case in point. But that is not what Solzhenitsyn is talking about. He needs to be told, "No, Mr. Solzhenitsyn, imperialism does not feed anyone; it is a system of robbery. It is not neutrality you are against. You are against the movements that are fighting imperialism."

Being a defender of imperialism, Solzhenitsyn takes an open stand against all struggles for national liberation. Speaking about the fighters against imperialism he states: "They might well have suggested, when we are attacked it is terrorism, but when we do the attacking it is a guerrilla movement of liberation." "They [meaning the national liberation forces] demand instead that we study the aims of terrorist groups, their basis of support and the guerrilla ideology, and then acknowledge them as sacred 'guerrillas'."

Yes—the national liberation movements fighting against imperialism are "sacred." Their base of support is the victims of imperialism, the people. Their base of support is the socialist countries, and the anti-imperialists throughout the world. Imperialism's practices and policies of repression are unjust—they are terrorism.

And, as if to document his own support of imperialism, he states: "Just as in the dubious classification of wars into 'just and unjust' we are confronted with a sordid challenge to the truth."

Taking Solzhenitsyn's sordid position, the war against fascism, our war of independence against England, and of course the Great October Socialist Revolution, which established the first socialist state, were not "just wars."

History demonstrates that wars of imperialist aggression fought in the interests of the monopoly corporations are "unjust." Wars fought against imperialist aggression and for national liberation and wars fought for socialism are "just." They are "just" because they are in the best self-interest of the great majority of the people; they are "just" because they are for social progress.

And to be consistent in supporting imperialism, this great "humanitarian" Solzhenitsyn does not protest the mass murder in Vietnam, he does not protest against the killings in My Lai, but instead sneers at the world peace movement for not protesting the "bestial mass killings in Hue."

Again, this is an attack by Solzhenitsyn on the victims of imperialism and those who condemn the murderous policies of imperialism. This is not a cry of concern for human life. This is a call to condemn the victims of imperialist aggression for having the courage and heroism to fight for their lands and their

families.

From the point of view of the direction of history, from the point of view of the world's people, from the point of view of how society and civilization as a whole will move to a higher and more humane plateau of existence, the struggles against imperialism, both in the form of national liberation and for socialism are absolutely "just." From the same viewpoint the efforts to preserve the system of exploitation, oppression and racism are *totally unjust*. When the forces of liberation and socialism are compelled to take up arms to resist either aggression or oppression it is a "just war."

Solzhenitsyn in his long dissertation does not have a word of criticism for the United States pilots who carried out the most heinous aerial bombardment in all of human history against Indochina's cities, farms, hospitals and schools. But he does take his stand with all the imperialist liars about the so-called "mis-treatment of the prisoners of war." He states that Ramsey Clark went to Hanoi "for his own political purposes," and "no one in the United States reproached Clark for it." And, as if to make his sordid point, he says, "After all that was not Watergate."

As one might well expect, the Solzhenitsyn thesis also defends Nixon and his Watergate cabal when he writes, "A similarly dense hypocrisy emanates from the distorted vision of the Senate leaders in the Watergate affair." By now it is clear who creates "distorted visions." Solzhenitsyn derides and slanders all "fighters for peace" and "peace partisans." This, of course, follows from his basic position of support to imperialism and his opposition to the struggle for peace. The "fighters for peace" are fighters against imperialism.

Solzhenitsyn is in the stagnant swamp because his forces of decadent reaction cannot win the minds of the people and he bemoans the "war of words which the West always seems to lose" and the "war of nerves or a contest in persistence which all the more the West is always doomed to lose."

Imperialism, which Solzhenitsyn supports and likes to call "the West," is "doomed to lose" because, as a system, it is on the rails of extinction. The laws of social development have condemned it to the ash can of history. And the Sakharovs and the

Solzhenitsyns of the world are not going to save it.

So it is quite clear that when Solzhenitsyn uses the words "non-violence," "peace," "the right to dissent," they are not general abstractions. He is not non-aligned. He is for "peace," he is for "non-alignment," only when such concepts serve the interests of imperialism. His "non-alignment" in its basic essence is anti-working class, anti-socialist and pro-imperialist. He is in alignment with world reaction.

When Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn speak about the need for "intellectual freedom" it is intrinsically related to their having freedom to spread this kind of anti-working class, anti-socialist, pro-imperialist, slanderous trash. They are asking the Soviet society to make available to them the mass media for this campaign.

It is also necessary to tie in the Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn "basics" with the problems of today. One would think that people who have repeated so often the words, "convergence," "peaceful co-existence," "the coming together of capitalism and socialism," "nuclear disarmament," would now hail the steps that are being taken to end the cold war, including the SALT talks, trade agreements, the concrete steps that give life to the policy of peaceful co-existence.

But this is not the case with Sakharov or Solzhenitsyn. In fact they are conducting a new campaign of slander against all peace proposals and against the Soviet Union's peace initiatives. In one press conference after another they are sending warnings to the reactionary forces in the United States: do not end the cold war, do not disarm, do not sign trade agreements, do not relax tensions.

These present-day actions expose their real intent. They are now giving a clear meaning to their thesis of "convergence." Their concept of "convergence" has nothing to do with relaxing tensions, or with ending the cold war. Their concept of "convergence" is based on the surrender of the working class and the surrender of socialism to imperialism.

The ending of the cold war, the lessening of world tensions, and the trade agreements, of course, do not move in that direction of surrender to imperialism. They are not policies of "convergence." That explains the hysterical cries of Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn

against the present steps towards detente.

Albert Shanker's Advertisements

Albert Shanker writes a weekly, paid advertisement column in the *New York Times* under a presumptuous heading, "Where We Stand." Of course, more and more members of the United Federation of Teachers are publicly saying "that is not where we stand." In most of the advertisements, Shanker peddles his right-wing, class collaborationist, racist and anti-communist wares. The September 23rd issue is an advertisement for Sakharov. This advertisement falls fully into the category of fake advertising. It peddles phony goods.

Shanker is not one of the many who are sincerely confused or uninformed. He is a political professional from the schools of social democracy. With Meany, Lovestone and Dubinsky, Shanker has become an active member of the AFL-CIO leadership club of cold warriors. They head the anti-communist crusade under the "labor" and "left" covers.

In keeping with Madison Avenue's concept of advertising in which truth is abandoned, Shanker states that in the Soviet Union "we are witnessing the persecution of dissidents." The facts are that Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn continue to receive their salaries, they have apartments in the cities and summer homes in the country. They are making the most outrageous, slanderous statements about the Soviet Union. They are publicly calling on the world to continue the policies of aggression against the Soviet Union, to continue the cold war, to cut off trade relations. They call for tariff discrimination against the Soviet Union. These are Shanker's "persecuted dissidents."

After stating the basic big lie, Shanker proceeds to weave the typical right-wing social-democratic and Zionist web. It is calculated to snare the uninformed. The supposed "persecution" is related, by Shanker, to the fascist persecution under Hitler. This, in fact, is a continuation of Hitler's big lie technique. But, as one can expect, in describing what happened in Hitler Germany, Shanker has to speak about "the opposition parties" because his swindle would fall on its face if he stated the truth—that it was the Communist Party of Germany that took the brunt of Hitler's

persecution; that it was the Communist Party that led the struggle against fascism in Germany. This truth does not serve Shanker's anti-communism based on the big lie. Shanker's concern for liberties does not cover the rights of the Soviet citizens who oppose Sakharov's anti-socialist "basics." The letters in the Soviet press that take issue with Sakharov's and Solzhenitsyn's campaign against socialism and the Soviet Union become a "ruthless campaign of vilification."

For all his crocodile tears, Shanker is not really concerned with the Sakharovs or Solzhenitsyns. He is only interested in using them to slander socialism and as instruments in his anti-communism. This is what big business demands from all of its loyal class servants. Shanker's anti-Soviet advertisements must be seen in the context of where he stands on other matters.

During the last ten years the acid test of where everyone stands on the rights of people has been the struggle against U.S. imperialism in Indochina. This has been a struggle for the most basic right of all—the right of people to live. During these ten years Shanker has not only refused to show any concern about this basic right, but he has been more concerned about the "rights" of U.S. imperialism. During this period Shanker has pulled out all stops in his efforts to block any resolution in the teachers union that would have openly and frankly condemned U.S. imperialism's aggression in Indochina.

Shanker has not placed any advertisements in defense of the victims of the fascist governments of Spain, Greece, Portugal, the Philippine Islands, South Africa, etc. Shanker quotes Solzhenitsyn as saying: "There are no internal affairs left on our crowded earth." That is but an echo of the old motto of U.S. imperialism called the open door policy. "Open the door," "let us in," there are no "internal affairs." Let the U.S. corporations exploit and oppress. Give U.S. imperialism a free hand. This the Shankers support when such policies can be used by U.S. imperialism. But when the Mid-East countries talk about using their oil resources to change U.S. policies toward themselves, that is considered a crime!

Shanker's anti-communism is a cover for his own racism that he constantly injects into the teachers union and into the struggles

of the teachers around the country. He uses red-baiting to divide the democratic opposition in the United Federation of Teachers which struggles against his class collaborationist policies. In fact, without such "persecution" of the opposition he could not remain in power in the union. If anyone is guilty of conducting "a ruthless campaign of vilification" it is Shanker. That is a good description of his policies in the teachers union. The September 23rd advertisement is an example of the "campaign of vilification" against socialism.

Shanker's support for the policies of U.S. imperialism around the world is but a continuation of his class collaborationist policies at home. It is a policy of collaboration with one and the same class, monopoly capital.

The Source of the Pollution

There remains one more question that must be dealt with: What has given rise to such ideological throwbacks as Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn? There are many factors which must be considered.

In the field of ideology, as in nature, even the best cultivated fields sprout some weeds. Actually, the overwhelming majority—yes, more than 99.9 per cent—of the intellectuals in the Soviet Union are dedicated workers contributing to and participating in every way in the building of socialism, in the advancement and the many achievements of the Soviet Union, in every area of life. They are not weeds.

It is necessary to put these throwbacks into a correct perspective. First, their numbers in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are but a small handful. They are played up and blown up all out of proportion, and used by the organs of monopoly capitalism. As a result they seem to be disgruntled about life in general. They are self-made, conscious, deliberate misfits. They are pseudo-intellectuals who seem to have a deep, antagonistic feeling towards workers and towards socialism because it gives workers a position of great honor, responsibility and authority. They lack the intellectual integrity to understand and accept the role of the working class in a socialist society.

One of Sakharov's supporters complains that: "The pages of newspapers are filled with letters from *workers, bulldozer opera-*

tors, oil drillers, engineers, teachers, mechanics and taxi drivers." (Emphasis mine—G.H.)

This tiny group of ideological throwbacks all seem to have an extremely puffed-up, exaggerated opinion of themselves. They all paint self-portraits in the Messiah image. They are under the illusion that only they are concerned with the "security of future mankind." They all seem to suffer from an illness of self-worship. They have infantile fixations about fantasy concepts based on conjured-up images of reality. Their political and ideological concepts are basically anti-working-class and anti-socialist. Their theses are open apologies for imperialism and the crimes of imperialism.

In order to understand the phenomenon of ideological throwbacks it is necessary to keep in mind that ideological and political currents are very much like air currents, including pollution. They are not respecters of national boundaries, and therefore circulate the world over. This is especially true in our modern age because of the modern instruments of mass communication.

Ideologically, the socialist world does not live in an isolation booth. There is no physical way that people can be insulated against the ideological penetration of the opposition class. For the countries of socialism that is not necessary. The serious intellectuals—and they are in the millions—contribute to and participate with the workers in the struggle to build socialism. The socialist countries have the most formidable weapon in the struggle against capitalist ideology. That is the truth that is Marxism-Leninism. The intellectuals participate in that struggle and see their interests as identical with the workers in the development of a new quality—a socialist quality in life and society.

Those who have no experience with the class struggle (which, after all, is the keystone of the truth of capitalism), and who also have no direct experience with the process of production under socialism and no personal experience of physical labor, seem to be more vulnerable to the imperialist propaganda. Most of them seem to have been so totally engrossed in some narrow or specific field of study, or human endeavor, that they have not kept up with, or studied, the sciences that give an understanding of the overall developments in the struggle for human progress. They seem to

have very little understanding of or grounding in the science of Marxism-Leninism.

If you mix all these ingredients together and possibly some other factors, you will get the Sakharovs and the Solzhenitsyns of the world. Their numbers are the very minimum, but their imperialist sponsors in the mass media exploit and use them and their slanders to the maximum.

In all these cases there seems to be a certain logical process. When you examine their backgrounds, at some point they each began to think they had all the answers, all the solutions to the problems in every area of life. This obviously led them to mistaken concepts. But because of their puffed-up self-estimation they rejected criticism and resented any opposition to their ideas. This led them to positions of opposition in one area after another.

The logic of this process was that they finally arrived at a point of being in opposition to everything, including socialism. When they reached this point they were ripe and ready to be influenced by the ideological positions of imperialism. And as they began to receive the high praises and the applause of imperialist ideologists they sank deeper into the swamp of opportunism and imperialism.

They were not grounded in the science of Marxism-Leninism. They had no understanding of the class struggle or the laws of capitalist development. Add to this the facts that they had no personal work experience, they are possessed with an exaggerated estimate of themselves, the criticism of their co-workers (and their rejection of any criticism), and you have some of the determining factors which led Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn to open betrayal of the working class and socialism.

"Intellectual Freedom" and Socialist Democracy

The *New York Times* and most of the newspapers and magazines in the United States have opened up their pages to this handful of renegades. Not one of them have asked the question: What is happening or what has happened to intellectual freedom and liberties in Chile? Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn have been carrying on their anti-socialist campaign openly for almost 10 years. They are holding almost daily press conferences. But the massive

campaign led by the *New York Times* is camouflaged behind the phrase "intellectual freedom."

The basic question is: "intellectual freedom" to what end, for what purposes? The basic thesis of Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn answers this question. Their purpose is obvious—to spread slanders and falsehoods about socialism, to spread apologies and to cover up and defend imperialism and every one of its crimes. Their cries for "intellectual freedom" are not to discuss birds, flowers or the weather or such problems as production, transportation, housing, health, science, energy or trade. Most important, their cries for "intellectual freedom" are not to discuss how to improve and how to speed up the building of socialism, but only to slander it in a fruitless attempt to destroy it.

So the obvious question to ask is: should a socialist society, in the name of "intellectual freedom," make its press, TV and radio stations available to a handful of renegades so they can spread their vile slanders against socialism, so they can spread their racism and imperialist propaganda? And another logical question to ask is: should a socialist country open the mass media to such elements to prove that socialism is "democratic?"

If, to prove its basic, democratic essence, socialism had to give a handful of vile slanderers free access to the media, then indeed there would be a serious crisis. And indeed it would prove nothing. The proof of socialist democracy is not dependent upon such gimmicks. Socialist democracy is not contingent upon the rights of a handful of renegades and traitors.

Socialist democracy is rooted in the basic principle of the defense of the socialist system. Socialist democracy develops and grows in the context of the realities of the struggle between the two world systems. Socialist democracy is not an abstraction, it is not a frill. It is an integral part of the building of socialism.

Socialist democracy is the elimination of racism and national chauvinism. Socialist democracy is the participation of the millions in the everyday decision-making process on all levels; it is the hundreds of thousands of people running the city councils, the courts, the Soviet Republics. Socialist democracy is the workers making all the basic decisions in the factories, the mines and the mills. Socialist democracy is in the election of government

bodies on every level. Socialist democracy is in the millions of letters in the public press criticizing, proposing and observing their socialist society at work.

Socialist democracy is interdependent with the process and the level of socialist construction. It grows and develops in that process. As with all new phenomena there is an element of trial and error in this process, but the direction is clear. The direction is towards an ever broader participation of the masses in the decision-making process on every level and in all areas of life. Therefore, whether the mass media in the Soviet Union should be turned over to these betrayers must be seen in the above context.

Common sense says, absolutely not! From the point of reference of the defense of socialism, and the world-wide struggle against imperialism and racism, the answer is also clear—absolutely not!

Democracy and democratic rights are not concepts that can be dealt with in a vacuum. They cannot be separated from the struggles of real life because they are an inherent part of real life itself. For example, how can anyone seriously talk about "democratic rights" without taking into consideration the real-life experience of World War II against fascism and the more than 54 million people who were killed, the 90 million wounded, and the material losses which amounted to more than 4 trillion dollars? More than 20 million citizens of the Soviet Union were killed in that war. Should such developments be permitted again in the name of "democratic rights" and should we again permit the lynching and burning at the stake of Black Americans? Such developments cannot be separated from the *advocacy* of such policies.

A society cannot exist that does not put some limits on the rights of individuals making up that society. A most basic question is: restrictions to what end?

Under capitalism democratic rights are related to the 5% of the population having the "right" to continue exploiting the other 95% of the population. Because the ruling class is the 5% and the system is a system of exploitation, such a society is inherently undemocratic. The nature of capitalist democracy is determined by two factors. It is related to the level, to the challenge, of the

opposition to monopoly capital. And it is related to the nature of the class struggle and the relationship of forces. The rise of the police-state structure that led to Watergate is related to both of these factors.

The *New York Times* is leading the pack in daily editorials and articles about the fact that Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn cannot get their books published in the Soviet Union. But in the United States the *New York Times* sings a different song. For example, this year, for a period of four months, the *New York Times* published articles on the 125th anniversary of the *Communist Manifesto*. But the *New York Times* has yet to publish the *Communist Manifesto*. And in the four-month campaign it refused to publish any articles written by Communists. The *New York Times*, which makes such a fuss about the publishing of books in the Soviet Union, has a total ban on books written by Communists and absolutely refuses to mention, and especially to review, any books written by Americans who are Communists.

For every book not published in the Soviet Union there are one hundred not published in the United States. The publishing establishment has a stock answer: "there is no market" for such books. For over 100 years the United States publishing corporations, and this includes the federal government's press, have maintained a ban on publishing Marxist or Communist books. This, to the editors of the *New York Times*, is "intellectual freedom."

Many Communist leaders in the United States were convicted, and some of us served up to 8 years in United States prisons, for the "crime" and the charge of thinking dangerous thoughts. The *New York Times*, and for that matter most of the forces that are so excited about "freedoms" 3,000 miles away, were either silent or led the reactionary wolf pack. How loud did these forces yell when the intellectual freedom, and the very life, of Angela Davis was at stake?

For more than 25 years Communists in the United States were denied passports and the right to travel outside the U.S.! Today the State Department denies all citizens the right to travel to Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Albania. Where is the hue and cry for "intellectual freedom" and the right to travel?

Today the Israeli Government with the support of Washington denies more than a million Palestinians the right to travel to their homes in Israel, and denies them the right to speak their views in their native land. Where is the voice of the Sakharovs and the Solzhenitsyns, the Salisburys and the Shankers?

Who can deny that the mass media in the United States are practically an exclusive, closed monopoly, concerned only with those who speak and act for monopoly capitalism? Whenever opponents of capitalism break through they are distorted and vilified. Most of the people who speak about "democratic rights" in a vacuum are demagogues because they know that there is no such thing.

The issue of "democratic rights" has become an instrument in the struggle against socialism, and more specifically it is an instrument of anti-Sovietism. This is especially true in the United States, and U.S. imperialism has been trying to export its false concept of democracy and of socialism to all parts of the world in order to advance the interests of imperialism. If this is not so, how is it that these forces are silent about areas where there are real problems of democratic rights, areas where democratic rights do not exist, as in South Africa, Portugal, Spain, Greece, the Philippine Islands, Chile, etc.?

Socialist democracy is not and never will be like bourgeois democracy. In the socialist countries such as the USSR the people as a whole are the owners and the trustees of the economic establishment of the nation, and they operate it for the common good—this by itself is infinitely more democratic than anything in existence under capitalism. Because of this basic fact the essence of socialist democracy is more in the sense of self-regulation than in restrictions imposed by another class.

Under capitalism the people have no real voice about economic questions, except the power that comes from struggle. But prices, trade, wages, production schedules, profits, are prerogatives of monopoly corporations. The political structure, including the two-party system and the government, as well as the mass media, are also controlled by the monopoly corporations. Where the "democratic rights" of the masses are concerned is indeed a very narrow spectrum of life. The talk about "democratic rights" under capitalism

is more rhetoric than real. In the context of being able to influence the course of events, the rights are more on paper than real. Even these rights are not gifts from monopoly capital; they are rights won by the working class and the people only through long, hard struggle.

The Sakharovs, Solzhenitsyns, Salisburys and Shankers are howling at decaying windmills. The basics of human progress are that human society is in the midst of history's greatest transition—from capitalism to socialism. This transition is as inevitable as the birth of a baby once it is conceived. The struggle for the policies of peaceful co-existence, for relaxation of world tensions, is very much related to this transition. The ideological struggle is related to this historic shift from one world system to another. The struggle against imperialism and against racism is rooted in this struggle.

On one side there are the varied forces of reaction, on the other the forces of the world revolutionary process. The struggle between them is determining at what speed civilization will advance and how soon it will reach new plateaus. The relationship of forces will determine what the sacrifices will be. The Sakharovs, Solzhenitsyns, Salisburys and Shankers of the world can add to the confusion, they can add to the cost in human life and suffering in the struggle for this transition, but there is no way they can in any way influence the final outcome.

WELTON 1000 18.00

- For daily news of the people's movements
- For viewpoints of the Communist Party

Published 5 times a week, including weekend edition
with *World Magazine*.

10 cents weekdays; 15 cents for weekend edition

Subscription rates:

1 year	\$15.00
6 months	\$ 8.00
3 months	\$ 2.00
1 year—weekend only	\$ 5.00
3 months—weekend only	\$ 1.00

Special rate for students,
G.I.s, unemployed & wel-
fare recipients:
1 year \$5.00 (daily)

DAILY WORLD

205 West 19 Street • 9th Floor • New York, N.Y. 10011

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Monthly theoretical journal of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Analysis and discussion of important issues of today from the
viewpoint of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Subscription rates:

1 year — \$6.00 6 months — \$3.00 Single Copies — 60¢

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

23 West 26 Street, New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

*Monthly theoretical and information journal of the
Communist and Workers' Parties.*

50¢ per copy

Subscription \$5.00 per year

North American edition distributed in the United States by:

IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS

320 West Ohio Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610